

REMARKS

Initially, applicants would like to express their appreciation to the Examiner for discussing the present application with applicant's representative on February 7, 2006. During the discussion, applicant's representative explained how the claims operate and how they are different from BJORNBERG et al. and STOCKER et al. Claim amendments were also discussed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 5, 7 - 12, and 14 - 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BJORNBERG et al. in view of STOCKER et al. The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over BJORNBERG et al. in view of STOCKER et al. in further view of LEVIN et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

As discussed during the interview, each DTK (or feature specific node type) has its own database (as recited in claims 1, 14, 16, 17, and 20). Such an architecture is different from that disclosed in the applied references, which show a common database. For example, BJORNBERG et al. shows audio files 204 which are common to all SIBBs.

Moreover, claim 7 further defines the call library application as allowing a caller to access pre-established messages from a customer maintained library. It is submitted that such a feature is not taught or suggested by the applied references.

Consequently, for at least these reasons, it is requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of independent claims 1, 7, 14, 16, 17, and 20 and provide an indication of their allowability.


Dependent claims 2 - 6, 8 - 13, 15, 18, 19, and 21 - 26 are also believed to recite further patentable subject matter of the invention and therefore are also believed allowable over the prior art. As such, allowance of the dependent claims is deemed proper for at least the same reasons noted for the independent claims, in addition to reasons related to their own recitations. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and an indication of the allowability of all of the claims in the present application.

The claim amendments add no prohibited new matter. They are supported by the specification, *inter alia*, at paragraphs 24, 45, and Fig. 2.

The above amendments have been presented merely for the purpose of clarification, and not to overcome the applied prior art. Accordingly, no estoppel is deemed to result from any of the present amendments.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
M. PLAN

Reg. No. 40,063


Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

February 24, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191